THEOLOGY

VOL. XLVI JULY, 1943 No. 277

The Bi-Centenary of an English Divine

A CENTURY ago the name of Paley was revered by cleric and layman alike; to-day it is comparatively unknown—a biographical curiosity. Formerly the works of this chief exponent of theological utilitarianism, famous also for his presentation of the theistic argument from design, were prominent on college and parsonage bookshelves; now they lie dust-laden in the recesses of our libraries or are offered for a few pence by second-hand dealers or—who knows?—committed to the salvage heap. *Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis.*

Intellectual fashions have been many since Paley's day. The recent history of moral philosophy, marking the disappearance of rationalism, the rise and fall of idealism inspired from the Continent, and the appearance of various hybrid ethical theories, has led us to disregard the moralists of the eighteenth century. Perhaps their sheer common sense is a little too much for the modern student. Yet Prof. A. E. Taylor remarks: "When the full history of the Germanic influence on our nineteenth-century literature comes to be written in a thoroughly critical spirit, a great deal will have to be done over the whole field in the way of rehabilitating reputations which have been unduly depreciated. . . It will then, I believe, be acknowledged that one of the more unfortunate effects of the intellectual conquest of Britain by Germany has been the curious neglect of the very rich and valuable ethical literature which begins with Cumberland and Cudworth (or perhaps, taking dates of publication into account, one should say Samuel Clarke) and culminated in Richard Price."[1] Perhaps Prof. Taylor would not include Paley as one of this illustrious line. Price died in 1791, Paley in 1805; but the latter may be said, at least, to be a valuable contributor to the philosophical literature of the eighteenth century.

The exact date of Paley's birth is unknown; but as he was baptized in Peterborough Cathedral, where his father was then a minor canon, on August 30, 1743, it is generally assumed that he was born in the July of that year—two hundred years ago this month. Later Paley's father became head master of Giggleswick School, in his native Yorkshire; and there the son was "educated under his father's eye."[2] In 1758 William was admitted a sizar of Christ's College, Cambridge, and in 1763 proceeded to his baccalaureate as first wrangler. An amusing incident, reflecting the theological atmosphere of the day, happened when Paley performed his *act*. Candidates were required to

[1] "Some Features of Butler's Ethics" in *Philosophical Studies*.

[2] Meadley: *Memoirs of Paley* (Sunderland, 1809). Paley's chief biography, though often unduly laudatory, contains many interesting sidelights; but copies are rare. For an easily accessible account *v.* Leslie Stephen's article in *D.N.B.*

defend a proposition set by the moderator; and in Paley's case it was one from Johnson's *Quæstiones Philosophicæ*, then a standard textbook at the University: *æternitas pœnarum contradicit divinis attributis*. The Master of Christ's objected, perhaps fearing frowns from Lambeth; but a solution was soon found. Paley inserted, with the moderator's approval, *non* into the proposition, and thereby proceeded to defend hell torments as readily as he would otherwise have objected. Another event in Paley's early academic career suggests more fairly and seriously his outlook. In 1765 he was awarded the senior bachelor's prize for a dissertation in Latin prose. The subject was *A Comparison between the Stoic and Epicurean philosophy, with respect to the influence of each upon the morals of a people*. Paley took the Epicurean side; we can hardly imagine any young scholar doing so a century later.

After a curacy at Greenwich, combined with a spell of schoolmastering at Blackheath, Paley returned to Christ's College in 1766 as a Fellow, and remained there until 1776. At Cambridge he earned a good reputation as a teacher, but probably his liberal views, modified later, about subscription to the XXXIX Articles—as much in discussion then as since—caused high authority to regard him with suspicion. Although he said once jokingly that he could not afford to keep a conscience, Paley must be given his due for never changing his opinions in order to gain favour—no mean testimony to his character, at a time when conscientious scruples often carried little weight.

Later Paley went to Cumberland, where, through Bishop Law's patronage, he held various livings in plurality, together with a prebendal stall at Carlisle. He also, in view of his legal interests, became chancellor of the diocese, and was for seven years Archdeacon of Carlisle. In 1794 Bishop Porteus of London made him a prebendary of St Paul's in recognition of his work as a Christian apologist, while his latter years were spent between Lincoln, where he was subdean, and the rectory of Bishop Wearmouth, where he died in 1805.

In figure, so Meadley tells us, Paley was ungainly, but active in mind. He was always ready for intellectual conversation, observant of his surroundings, which provided many practical illustrations for his books, and by no means lacking in a sense of humour. He spoke with a harsh, north-country accent, but as a preacher was forceful and to the point. His mathematical training and legal experience are reflected in his clear reasoning power; but, perhaps to his disfavour, one notes that he rarely referred to current literature—*e.g.*, he appears to have been unaware of Kant—and that he never answered his critics. Nevertheless, he is one of the few English divines who have left behind them a complete theological system: his *Natural Theology*, *Evidences of Christianity* and *Moral and Political Philosophy*, though not written in this order, form a triad, and were regarded as standard works until a generation or so ago.

The *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, Paley's first major book, was published in 1785. What most modern writers, usually on second-hand information, take exception to in Paley's ethics is his alleged blatant utilitarianism. He is regarded as a cheap clerical imitator of Bentham; whereas, in fact, he was Bentham's contem-

porary, obtained many of his ethical ideas from earlier writers, notably Abraham Tucker, and founded his utilitarianism on a basis different from that of the Benthamites. Most critical works which deign to mention Paley dismiss him in a few lines, quoting his celebrated definition of moral integrity as if it were a sufficient condemnation: "Virtue is the doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness." To pursue virtue for the sake of an other-worldly reward is held to be an immoral motive; to which two observations are evoked in reply.

First, such critics ignore the theistic basis of Paley's ethic emphasized in the words "in obedience to the will of God"; and secondly, they would evidently prefer to live the good life for no reason in particular. Paley did not hold a romantic view of human nature; his stress on the thought of reward and punishment is a tribute to his psychology. To do good simply for the sake of goodness is typical of modern vagueness; however ardent idealists we may be, it is difficult, in ordinary life, satisfactorily to conceive of goodness—or any other spiritual value—as an *ens in se*. It is this type of ethereal thought of which the world is growing increasingly impatient.

Paley was, however, like the greatest of men, a child of his times: he could not remain immune from the intellectual influences of his generation. As such he stands out with regard to his ethics as a link between the older theological tradition and the newer hedonism. He is a representative Englishman, moderate and conservative, yet anxious for the maintenance of political, intellectual and religious liberty. His guiding principle was that all should be done for the common happiness, which principle he accepts as God-given, to be determined by the precepts of the Christian revelation and, where they were wanting, by the light of nature. The school of Rousseau thus finds its way into the common sense of an English archdeacon who saw in the general consequences of conduct the means of judging the utility of actions—*i.e.*, their ability to contribute to "the greatest happiness of the greatest number."

Whether, in this way, Paley did justice to the Gospel which he professed remains open to doubt. Either he thought the New Testament had a utilitarian basis, a contention which many will rightly deny; or, what is more likely, he accepted its revelation without question on grounds other than ethical, and added to it his utilitarian standard where it made no explicit provision. It must be remembered that in his day revelation was widely accepted as authoritative and final. We, obsessed by the subjectivism which scientific method breeds, confess a difficulty in viewing reality in this manner. We have so relegated deity to the background of thought that we equate Him with the abstract principle of natural law or with an imaginary sum-total of human benevolence. The modern man is often unable to credit the independence of God from His creation. The pantheistic identification of God with mind or with nature or with the community has for long greatly debilitated religious thought. The objective nature of the existence of God is disregarded; and in consequence all spiritual norms, including those of conduct, are manifestly relative.

Even if we do not accept Paley's ethical or his other theories in detail we must admit that their theistic basis gives a firm foundation to philosophical concepts. Paley's approach to theism, set out in his *Natural Theology*, which opens with the famous watchmaker analogy is teleological. His biological illustrations, which are a tribute to his wide if not expert erudition, may not be accurate according to modern science; but his general theory of design is still as tenable as when it first appeared in 1802.[1] Yet the orthodox doctrine that God created *ex nihilo*, that He is independent of and not dependent on His creation is remote from the modern mind, though there are signs that the fashion is changing. But not even Paley, we submit, would have asserted that the argument from design was sufficient of itself. The theistic 'proofs' are not contradictory but complementary; they are rationalizations, in the theological sense—instances of *fides quærens intellectum*. To them must be added the conviction of genuine religious experience and the approach to religion made by such scholars as those of the Schleiermacher-Otto tradition.

In discussing fundamental problems, of which the existence and attributes of deity, the purpose of creation, and the authority of moral are examples, we are driven back, if we are to form any constructive philosophy, on *a priori* knowledge. Kant found that this was the only way out of the pyrrhonic impasse resultant from the thought of men like Hume. Paley, unconsciously no doubt, tried to preserve the older rationalism, based mainly on *a posteriori* reasoning, handed down by the great divines, and to combine with it, in its ethical implications, the utilitarianism of his day. In the former he approximates to the Aristotelian tradition, as against the dualistic tendency of the Platonic line which reappeared in Descartes, and the pantheistic tendency in later forms of idealism. In the latter, his utilitarianism, he shows himself aware of the contemporary mood; but Paley was constrained, in his version, to maintain the cause of Christian orthodoxy in the face of those who were beginning to view ethics, economics and politics as independent of religious sanctions.

With Paley, however, deity, being the author of all things, came first and the general welfare of the community second. Non-theological utilitarianism pointed the way to the happy society without God, or as for some thinkers in the last century, to what is even more ludicrous the happy society which *is* God. Can anything be more absurd to us as we survey the ruins of nineteenth-century optimism, which were crumbling fast long before Hitler, a neo-Hegelian natural, confirmed the instability of his spiritual progenitors?

The *Evidences of Christianity* and the *Horæ Paulinæ* deal less with general principles of belief and conduct than Paley's other *magnum opus*. The object is to vindicate the Christian revelation by reference to Christian origins. Here Paley the archdeacon and justice of the peace is clearly at work; for he states his case in a lawyer-like manner. New Testament criticism has necessitated a guarded acceptance of some of his argu-

[1] Even so independent a writer as Dr Wood Jones, in his recent *Design and Purpose*, while criticizing Paley as a champion of orthodoxy, pays tribute to his argument from design.

ments; but his appeal to the witness of the first Christians as an adequate proof of the veracity of the events of the Gospel, notably the Resurrection, is almost unanswerable. In the *Evidences* Paley ventures to cross swords with Hume on the subject of miracles; and his performance is well stated, if not original.[1] The closing paragraph of the *Horæ Paulinæ* is not only a first-rate instance of Christian apologetic, but also a fine passage of English composition; and we think it deserves quotation, if only in part. After enumerating the labours and hardships of St Paul in the service of the Gospel, the details of which are testified by both the *Acts* and the *Epistles*, Paley forestalls his opponent and asks "whether falsehood was ever attested by evidence like this. Falsehoods, we know, have found their way into reports, into traditions, into books; but is an example to be met with of a man voluntarily undertaking a life of want and pain, of incessant fatigue, of continual peril; submitting to the loss of his home and country, to stripes and stonings, to tedious imprisonment, and the constant expectation of a violent death, for the sake of carrying about a story of what was false, and of what, if false, he must have known to be so?"

Paley's other works consist mainly of pamphlets on contemporary controversies, archidiaconal charges and sermons, published posthumously. We mention two of special interest. A leaflet entitled *Reasons for Contentment, addressed to the labouring part of the British Public* appeared in 1793, following widespread unrest among the lower classes as a result of war-time conditions and the excesses of high society. Paley's conservatism may sound strange, even amusing, to us; but he ably exposes the principle at stake. The very laws, he points out, which protect the possessions of the rich protect also those of the poor, however small. To tamper with the rights of one would necessarily open the way to tampering with the rights of the other; and, in such troubled times, revolution would be "not only to venture out to sea in a storm, but to venture for nothing." His *Advice Addressed to the Young Clergy of the Diocese of Carlisle*, an ordination sermon preached in 1781, is of more definite Church interest. The language is inclined to be pompous, but the subject-matter is sound and as worthy of consideration as ever. There is, too, a fine peroration. Paley warns against seeking popularity, and recommends a life of frugality, sobriety, reserve and seriousness. He includes some wise comments on sermon construction, one of which ought to be evident in every parson's study: "Propose one point in one discourse, and stick to it; a hearer never carries away more than one impression." As to his sermons in general, one cannot but be struck by Paley's frequent recourse to biblical exposition and apt illustration. He provides his congregation with strong meat indeed, as a glance at his subjects shows.

Paley stands out in the history of English theology, not perhaps as an original thinker,[2] but as a brilliant protagonist of Christian common sense. He is well fitted to symbolize English clerical scholarship at its

[1] *V.* Creed and Boys Smith: *Religious Thought in the Eighteenth Century*. Hume and Paley are both quoted *ad hoc*. There are other representative extracts from Paley.

[2] His indebtedness to earlier writers—*e.g.*, Locke, Nieuwentyt, Lardner and Tucker, is obvious. The *Horæ Paulinæ* is usually considered his most original work.

best; and it is a pity that his appreciation has been neglected because the more daring and unorthodox, particularly if hailing from the Continent, have until recently overawed the English student. Paley's ethical system is essentially one for application, and his theology for everyday acceptance; perhaps therein lies their weakness! We may be inclined, after examination, to declare him a philosophical mediocrity; but Paley never sought fame. His reputation is derived from his intellectual sanity and his gift of clear exposition, both of which, contrary to popular supposition, have always appealed widely to Anglican churchmen. Much of his work is of permanent value, but much also is now irrelevant. Our world, separated from his by a hundred and fifty years, is far different. Then there were generally accepted standards, personal, national and even international; now there are few. The age of chivalry, the passing of which was so eloquently lamented by Burke, was only just beginning to give place to "that of sophisters, economists and calculators."

D. W. Gundry.

Surbiton.

Church and State in England and Scotland—II

My excuse for dealing at such length last month with the history of Presbyterianism in Scotland must be that it is impossible to understand the significance of the Act of 1921 apart from its historical setting. The statement of the Archbishops' Commission that "the spiritual autonomy of the Scottish Church had long been unequivocally recognized" is simply untrue. In order to secure spiritual autonomy many had left the Established Church, and these seceders had now been made to realize that the problem of Church and State was less simple than they had imagined, and that acceptance of the "Voluntary Principle" did not in itself guarantee the spiritual liberty which they had believed themselves to possess.

A paradoxical result of the House of Lords' judgment was that it strengthened rather than weakened the movement for Presbyterian reunion. Now that the members of the United Free Church realized that they were less independent of the State than they had imagined, they began to feel that there was a certain unreality in their separation from the Established Church, from which they differed so little in doctrine, worship and organization. This tendency was encouraged by other facts—for instance, the alarm felt in Presbyterian circles at the great increase of the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, whose adherents were streaming over from Ireland, and by the general spirit of the age, which favoured the assumption by the State of activities which had previously been left to private enterprise. At a time when the hold of any form of religion on a great section of the population appeared to be weakening, even those who had been opposed to the Establishment Principle began to feel that recognition of religion by the State was desirable and that to disestablish the Church would be to play into the hands of the enemies of religion.

It was in this atmosphere that the negotiations were conducted which led to the passing of the Act of 1921 and to the union in 1929 of the vast majority of Scottish Presbyterians in the Church of Scotland. From the beginning it was realized that if a repetition of the disaster of 1904 were to be avoided steps must be taken to secure in advance recognition by the State of the legality of the contemplated union. It was fully understood that the Church, just like any other association or corporation, cannot fairly expect the State to grant it unbridled liberty, and that it can only claim to exercise its functions and hold its property if it has gained the approval of the State for its constitution. This point has been put well by Dr Carnegie Simpson. "It will not do," he writes, "for a church to have what I may describe as an attack of conscience and peremptorily demand freedom to exercise it, expecting that, on such a demand, the State will let it do as it likes. For the State too has a conscience. Part of the State's appointed duty is to take cognizance of all public societies and public interests. The Church is certainly a great public society, and its acts affect public interests in many ways. The Church should be a good citizen, even in the very act of asserting its spiritual freedom. It should declare its character and claim its liberties as an autonomous spiritual society in terms which the State can read and with which it can deal."

It was in accordance with these principles that the ground was prepared for an approach to the Government; it was determined to draw up a clear statement of the Church's own conception of her character and functions and of the extent of the freedom which she claimed the right to exercise. In order to avoid the appearance of dictation by Parliament it was proposed that these so-called "Declaratory Articles" should not be formally adopted by the General Assembly until Parliament had declared them to be lawful and had repealed any legislation inconsistent with them. This was agreed to, and the Act contains the words: "All such statutes and laws in so far as they are inconsistent with the Declaratory Articles are hereby repealed and declared to be of no effect." The Church was not bound to adopt the Articles, but was authorized by the State to do so in spite of any existing legislation.

I cannot, of course, do more than give a short summary of these Declaratory Articles. The first of them declares that the Church of Scotland accepts orthodox Trinitarian Christianity, adheres to the principles of the Scottish Reformation (a surprisingly vague phrase to appear in an Act of Parliament), and regards the Bible as its supreme rule of faith and life. The following clauses state that the Westminster Confession is its "principal subordinate standard" and that its form of government is Presbyterian. The claim is made that the Church has received from its Divine Head "the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate and to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline," and that the civil authority has no "right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction." "The Church and the State owe mutual duties to each other, and acting within their respective spheres may signally promote each other's welfare"; it is throughout assumed that these spheres are distinct.

In Article V we read that the Church has the "inherent right" to interpret its Confession of Faith and "to modify the forms of expression therein or to formulate other doctrinal statements," the Church being the sole judge as to whether such statements are in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith.

In some ways the most important of these Articles is No. VIII, which definitely limits the freedom claimed by the Church in the interpretation and modification of its formularies. Such action must always be consistent "with the provisions of the first Article, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life." Now it is in Article I that the Church declares its adherence to Trinitarianism and to the principles of the Scottish Reformation, so that if it accepted Unitarian doctrine or abandoned its particular form of Protestantism it could claim no protection from the Act and could be held to have committed a breach of trust. On the other hand, as there is no mention in Article I of any form of Church government, it would apparently be possible for the Church of Scotland to abandon Presbyterianism and accept Episcopacy without any violation of her title-deeds.

By this settlement, which was followed in 1925 by another Act, confirming the Church of Scotland in the possession of the greater part of her endowments, a status was conferred on that church which may well be envied not only by the Church of England but by all religious bodies in the country. The Church of Scotland remains an Established Church in so far as it retains its endowments and is responsible for such religious functions as are performed in Scotland on public occasions; a representative of the King continues to attend the meetings of the General Assembly. At the same time its right to "legislate and to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline," is recognized by an Act of Parliament which admits that the civil authority has no "right of interference with the proceedings or judgments of the Church within the sphere of its spiritual government and jurisdiction." In this matter much credit must, I think, be given to the statesmanlike way in which the leaders of the Scottish Church absorbed the lessons taught by the House of Lords' decision of 1904. They realized that Church and State cannot coexist on amicable terms without the existence of some concordat agreeable to both, and that the State cannot be expected to grant an absolutely unrestricted liberty to any body within itself, whether religious or non-religious. Accordingly they did not hesitate to ask for Parliamentary approval of their new constitution, in which they claimed a greater degree of liberty than they had possessed in the past. It remains to be asked why the supporters of the Enabling Act of 1919 did not even consider the possibility of inviting Parliament to confer on the Church of England the generous terms which were granted with so little difficulty two years later to the Church of Scotland.

In the evidence which he gave before the Archbishops' Commission Dr Carnegie Simpson mentioned three considerations which made a settlement of this question comparatively easy for the Church of Scotland. (1) The principle involved, he says, had been consistently

maintained all through the history of the Reformed Church of Scotland. I hope that enough has been said in the earlier part of this paper to show that this point may well be exaggerated. Champions of religious liberty have frequently seceded from the Church in order to secure it, and on the other hand there has always been in the Church of Scotland a considerable Erastian element which welcomed the ties which bound Church to State. (2) The second point is that there was no party division on this issue either ecclesiastically or politically. This is certainly true. As I have shown, the agitation for Disestablishment which drove Scottish Presbyterians into opposite political camps had died down early in the century, and as regards doctrine there was far more agreement than exists in the Church of England to-day. (3) Dr Simpson's third point is that the Scottish people concurred in the settlement because it had no fear that freedom meant "clericalism." This point is certainly worth making. More than one witness before the Commission emphasized the importance of adequate representation of the laity in Church affairs. It has been the strength of the Church of Scotland that Christian laymen have always been allowed to take a leading part in its activities. Every parish possesses a kirk session composed of elders who assist the minister in spiritual as well as temporal affairs. Half the members of the General Assembly itself consist of laymen. It is impossible to assert that lay opinion in the Church of England has such adequate means of expression in spite of the existence of the House of Laity in the Church Assembly. Until the abolition of the Test Acts it was arguable that Anglican lay opinion was adequately represented by the members of the two Houses of Parliament, but it was a ridiculous anachronism when at the time of the Prayer-Book controversy the view was put forward that the House of Commons as at present constituted had a greater right to express the views of the Anglican laity than their representatives in the Church Assembly.

Another point made by Dr Simpson in his evidence is well worth mentioning. He suggests that if at some future date the Church of England follows the Scottish precedent it should employ somewhat different language. "It is not," he says, "the best way to introduce this subject to the English political mind to base it on an abstract 'right' received from the Church's Divine Head and King. Many persons," he continues, "who have no wish to speak of such ideas but with respect religiously, hardly know what to make of them in the business of politico-ecclesiastical settlement and in an Act of Parliament. No issue should be raised about an 'inherent right,' a claim not legible in Anglican history, unfamiliar even to many good church-people and unintelligible to most parliamentarians." I am sure that Dr Simpson is justified in saying this, though it must be admitted that many worthy members of the Church of Scotland in the past would have been made a little uncomfortable by the Declaratory Article which asserts that the Church "has the inherent right, free from interference by civil authority, to declare the sense in which it understands its Confession of Faith, to modify the forms of expression therein or to formulate other doctrinal statements."

If the Church of England hopes to obtain from Parliament anything like the same degree of autonomy in matters spiritual as has been conceded to the Church of Scotland two things seem to me to be necessary. (1) It must be prepared to submit a somewhat detailed statement of its principles similar to the Declaratory Articles of the Act of 1921. It must state clearly the matters in which it desires more freedom, and the extent of the freedom for which it asks. Even the Church of Scotland accepted very definite limitations to its right to modify its doctrines, and pledged itself to adhere to Trinitarian Protestantism. Unless the Church of England is prepared to tie its hands to some extent, it is unlikely to be successful in its approach to Parliament, which, as was shown in 1927, views with distrust certain tendencies within the Church. Until practical unanimity can be secured, it would be futile to take any steps. In the draft of Declaratory Articles which was submitted to the Archbishops' Commission by the Church Self-Government League the maintenance of the threefold ministry appears as a fundamental article of the Church's creed. Even this might prove a stumbling-block, and far more serious difficulties would arise if any reference were made to sacramental doctrine. These considerations make it clear that at any rate a minimum degree of agreement must be reached between the various parties in the Church before the drafting of Declaratory Articles can be taken in hand. (2) The second point is almost equally important. If greater powers are to be conferred on the Church of England agreement must be reached on the question, What body or bodies are to be entitled to express the Church's will? The proposal of the Commission was that a measure should be considered as doing so which (*a*) had been approved by the two Convocations and (*b*) had been accepted by the Church Assembly and also by at least three-quarters of the Diocesan Conferences in both provinces. Whether Parliament would consider this machinery adequate is at any rate doubtful. In his evidence before the Commission Sir Maurice Gwyer declared that it would be necessary to constitute a new law-making body for the Church. "The two Convocations," he said, "are provincial and not national assemblies, nor do they provide any representation for the laity. The Church Assembly is a national body, but it is of very recent creation, and, apart from the question whether it has yet acquired a sufficient prestige or authority, its powers in matters of doctrine and ritual are strictly limited by its present constitution. . . . The Church of England would have to secure the general assent of its members to a constitutional reorganization before it could approach Parliament with any hope of success." He declares that any new law-making body would have to be broadly based and contain adequate representation of the laity, and that it could not be allowed to exercise the right which the Church Assembly now enjoys of passing measures repealing or amending Acts of Parliament, or indeed of passing any measure which would have the force of an Act of Parliament.

There is one other aspect of the subject about which a word must be said. The approach made to Parliament by the Church of Scotland in 1921 was closely connected with the problem of reunion. One of the

Declaratory Articles claims for the Church of Scotland the right to unite with any Church in which it finds "the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised" without loss of its identity. Use was made of this power in 1929 when a union was consummated with the United Free Church, which had been formed by the amalgamation of almost all bodies which had seceded from the Established Church. It had long been a crying scandal that there were to be found in almost every village two or even three churches practically indistinguishable from each other in doctrine and in form of worship. The promising movements towards union had received a severe setback from the House of Lords' decision of 1904, which made it clear that no amalgamation could safely be carried through which had not obtained parliamentary sanction. The situation in England is completely different. The number of Protestant Nonconformists in Scotland is now very small, while in England the Free Churches contain a very large section of the Christian population. Without their consent and approval it would be impossible for the Anglican Church to secure the passing of a Bill similar to the Church of Scotland Act. Whether English Nonconformists would allow the Church of England to receive complete autonomy and at the same time to retain her privileges and endowments is at any rate doubtful. This consent could only be secured if the Declaratory Articles were so drafted as to facilitate union with themselves. Those responsible for framing the Articles could hardly avoid the problem whether the aim of the Church of England should be reunion with Protestant Nonconformity or with the Roman Catholic Church.

In view of all these difficulties it appears to me that the time has not yet arrived when the matter can be taken in hand with any hope of success. Many Anglicans are still doubtful whether the Church Assembly gives adequate expression to the will of the Church. In any case that body, which has existed for little over twenty years, has not yet acquired the prestige enjoyed by the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. Scotland is a small and homogeneous country, and what is possible there may well be impracticable in the far more complicated situation which exists in England. However close may be the bonds which have united the Church of England to the State, she has in practice enjoyed a very considerable degree of freedom, and has provided a spiritual home to men and women of the most varied types, who have found a most precious bond in their devotion to the Book of Common Prayer. We may well be thankful that the use of this Liturgy has been enforced by the State, for it is at least a tenable view that the bonds which unite the Church to the State are also the bonds which preserve the unity of the Church.

G. H. Stevenson.

University College,
Oxford.

(Concluded.)

Parish Magazines

THIS is a brief report of an exhibition of parish magazines held last year at Westcott House, Cambridge. 150 magazines were exhibited, a very small sample of the thousands of different magazines published monthly (11,085 per month in 1936), but this sample was representative of many types of parish in both town and country. The exhibits were divided into groups, one showing successful attempts to present Christian teaching in simple and modern language, another showing various outer covers, another magazines well arranged and well printed, and another entitled "chamber of horrors," with examples of clerical thought and taste as grotesque as any of the figures in the basements of Madame Tussaud's. The most immediate and lasting impression of the whole series was of much patient and well-intentioned work, far less effective than it deserved to be. Many editors seemed to have considered neither aims nor technique; their scrupulous avoidance of uniformity or attention to modern journalistic methods was unfortunate, almost impious.

Parish magazines were one of the inventions of the last century designed to revive the parishes. Formerly the distribution of tracts had been a respectable means of propaganda, but in 1859 Canon Erskine Clark wrote the first magazine. The diligence of the clergy and Gladstone's repeal of the paper duty in the following year led to a rapid increase in the number of publications, which has grown steadily until in 1936 the total monthly circulation reached the very high figure of 2,700,000 (see J. M. Swift, *The Parish Magazine*, pub. Mowbray). But progress in quantity has not been accompanied by a development in technique comparable to that in the secular papers, so that this vast series of publications is not a propaganda machine of any great power. The earliest exhibit, a magazine published in 1876 in the remote Cumberland village of Plumpton, would not seem odd in a Church bookshop to-day in the way in which an early edition of *The Illustrated London News* would appear incongruous among modern magazines. But far more serious than the failure in technique is confusion over the aim of the magazine. The Church is surrounded by an environment that is either hostile or indifferent, but few magazines showed a note of urgency or any intelligent determination to make the most of the means of propaganda that the paper controller has left. Parish magazines are important; though the English Church has several weekly papers, it has the advantages and disadvantages of possessing no daily newspaper. In the present situation the aim of a parish magazine should be to teach both Christians and others. Whatever may be true of other ages and other places, to-day in the parish magazine it is by *didache* and not by *kerygma*, still less by records of Church activities, that men will be saved.

Of the 150 exhibits about thirty aimed at teaching their readers, and about fifteen of these contained articles intelligible to non-Christians, too low a proportion if it is remembered how many read these magazines yet never attend church. At present theologians and

conferences and news-letters provide a continual flow of material suitable for reprinting, often without alteration. It is unnecessary to print every month the figures of the collections in church, to the exclusion of more important teaching, since this gives the impression that the Church is less interested in crowns in heaven than in half-crowns in the bag. Teaching for Christians was admirably given in the magazine of St Swithin's, Lincoln (February, 1942). In eight small pages there were articles on the meaning of the word "sin," the Christian duties as citizen, the story of St Veronica, "Does God answer Prayer?", "Things you do in Church and Why" (a monthly feature, this month on the Churching of Women), as well as a little of the usual news and gossip. In April, 1942, St Matthew's, Moorfield, Bristol, published an excellent series of notes on the whole of the Holy Week services interpreted as a drama. As an example of teaching delivered at the right moment, we may mention the extremely judicious and well-informed article on the Primacy and the methods of selection during the last hundred years, which appeared in the magazine of St Mary Redcliffe in March, 1942. The Epsom Parish Magazine reprinted some of the Christian speeches for which the daily papers often have no room. These few examples have been chosen to show that clear teaching in all branches of religious knowledge can be given in a parish magazine. The articles intended for non-Christians were mainly attempts to show the relevance of religion in politics: St John's Kirk Chronicle, Perth (Church of Scotland), on communism (May, 1942), Parson Cross, Sheffield, on industrial problems, and the *Redfield Review* on current political questions. St Mark's, Bush Hill Park (May, 1942), in an attempt to give facts rather than opinions about Christianity in industry, published a series of short paragraphs written by workers showing the difference Christianity made in various factories. Such paragraphs are a useful supplement to more theoretical articles on the Christian philosophy of work (*e.g.*, Dorothy Sayers, "What is a Worker?" in the *Redfield Review*). *Waterloo Bridge* (the broadsheet of St John's in the Crypt) had excellent articles intended for more critical readers; an extended review of Huxley's *Grey Eminence* and an account of Christian resistance in Germany. The attempt to teach both the Christian congregation and those unattached to the Church should be the main concern of the editor of the parish magazine, be the demands for accounts of whist drives or congratulations to church workers never so strong.

Though the magazines we have so far mentioned came from town parishes, the country handicaps of small circulations and less space were in a few cases overcome. The exhibition contained a set of magazines from Wrenbury (Cheshire), where under two vicars scholarship was wisely used. Early in this century a series of notes on the story of the village was printed to form a unique local history. The account was not homiletic but detached and relevant. Vivid but truthful pictures of the dark ages, of the coming of the monks and the building of the church, of the Conqueror's iniquitous game laws, of the parishioners who fought at Poitiers, besides being of interest to most readers, gave a sense of perspective against which the present could be judged. More

recently this parish magazine contained the story of its patron, St Margaret of Antioch, not written in the popular hagiographical style but distinguishing romance and history and suggesting the ideals of the country parish. The theology of the Church's year was expounded month by month with a directness which is rare. "The tragedy of Calvary is not something to 'point a moral or adorn a tale.' It is, we believe, the very act of God whereby He works to destroy sin in us." For many years this country magazine had been talking the language of "radical biblical realism" without knowing it.

We have neither the desire nor the material to compile a black record from the curiosities found while reading several hundred magazines. A sense of historicity, a sense of humour, and a little knowledge of printing would have eliminated most of the mistakes. "I must apologize for a mistake made last month. I wonder I did not notice it. Saturn's day should not have read 10 hours. Actually it is 10 hours 15 minutes." To use a parish magazine to propagate inaccurate astrology is possibly no more harmful than to fill the Vicar's Letter with complaints of overwork and underpayment. The *Carlisle Diocesan Gazette* (September, 1941, p. 164) achieved a miracle of bad printing by using at least fourteen different types to describe four diocesan societies. Frequently the covers contained many of the worst features of the Victorian stained-glass window. But some magazines were well printed and arranged with headings and paragraphs to assist the majority of readers, who are accustomed to the *Daily Express* and not *The Times* leading article. Skilful photography and printing gave St Mary's, Merton (Wimbledon), the most attractive cover. The "Penguin" size magazine (*e.g.*, *Men Only*, an excellent example of modern printing) is preferable to the usual octavo size. Illustrations are expensive but greatly improve any magazine, whether they are photographs (as in the *Southwark Diocesan Gazette*, the best of the diocesan insets) or woodcuts (*Waterloo Bridge*) or stencil drawings (as in the enterprising magazine of St Luke's, Downham, which in June, 1942, consisted of seventeen typed pages and was entirely produced by voluntary work).

The purpose of the exhibition at Westcott House was to draw attention to that very small percentage of parish magazine editors who realized the importance of their work and tried to advance on the prevalent scheme of the Vicar's Letter, followed, appropriately enough, by a list of funerals. The magazine must contain parochial news, but this should be subordinate to consecutive teaching both for the congregation and for the outsider. Even if the editors agree thus far, their good intentions are too often frustrated by language which is more unearthly than otherworldly; too often they seem to be unconscious disciples of Talleyrand, who said that "Speech was given to man to disguise his thoughts." But when the magazine is readable it may not be read. At one parish, however, the fortnightly magazine is frequently the basis for discussion at a weekly parish meeting. Here the magazine is not the vicar's monthly manifesto but one of the means by which the Christian community grows in understanding and cohesion. The magazine is then fulfilling its true and original function, the strengthen-

ing of the Christian community in the parish. For this reason the parish, not the deanery or the diocese or some other group, should be the basis of the magazine even though a larger unit would enable higher standards in space and printing to be reached. The achievements of a few parishes deserve the attention of the rest.

ALAN WEBSTER.

SHEFFIELD.

BOOK REVIEWS

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE. By F. Copleston, S.J. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 8s. 6d.

Fr Copleston says in his preface that no one need apologize in these days for writing a book about Nietzsche. This is true, and in more senses than one. First, no one need apologize for writing any book in these days, provided that he knows how, and especially if he be as fair and lucid a writer as Fr Copleston. Secondly, although one had thought that the relationship between Nietzsche and the Nazis had been made clear, so much nonsense is again being written about German culture that the author stands in no need of excuse for thinking that the matter needs clarifying all over again. A third reason (the author's second) is that "culture" is a current issue of some importance, and Nietzsche had valuable ideas on the subject. As "philosopher of culture," Nietzsche is carefully and fairly explained and criticized in this book. But the aim is a limited one. Nietzsche's ideas are to be criticized from the Christian standpoint. Not only so, but Fr Copleston disclaims the intention of providing an introduction for Christians to the works of Nietzsche. He seems to indicate that "convinced Christians" should not read those works, or, at least, should not read some of them. We may suppose that the book is designed either for Roman Catholics who have heard of Nietzsche and would like to know why they should not read him, or else for his non-Roman or non-Christian readers disposed to inquire what a Jesuit philosopher has to say about him. Both categories are well served. But the book for all its fairness and clarity has a superficial ring to it. In fact, the author admits as much, hinting that he may write a profounder study of the subject at a later date. It is to be hoped that he will. But it is to be feared that the itch in at any rate one reader's mind has deeper roots. Fr Copleston says and shows that Nietzsche was a great man. It is true, also, that the reading of this book suggests that it is Christian criticism that can extract the best from Nietzsche. (Strict Nietzscheans, as is the way with strict disciples, have chiefly succeeded in bringing out the absurder aspects of their master's teaching.) But the book only *suggests* the fact. Nietzsche was a thinker of astonishingly penetrating insights and it is coming to be seen that he rootled about in the subsoil of the modern mind to the profit of few things so much as the Christian Faith. It is in this respect that the book is disappointing; and it is not the author's fault. The truth is, Romanism has a vested interest in precisely that aspect of modern Christian thinking, the limitations of which

Nietzsche in his blind and furious way had grasped. Like Kierkegaard and Dostoevsky, he worked on deeper levels than that on which the authorized philosophy of Catholicism went its rational, tranquil way. There was not much light down there. Fr Copleston inevitably concentrates on this fact. What we want to know about nowadays is what he had discovered and was grappling with in the darkness.

BRIAN WORMALD.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE VIRGIN BIRTH IN HISTORY AND FAITH. By Douglas Edwards, C.R. Faber. 12s. 6d.

Twenty years ago (we are told) the writer of this book was a "simple Christian," a "non-expert." He might have been one still had it not been for some reprehensible people called "sceptical critics" who said that the historical evidence for the Virgin Birth was insufficient and so misled simple Christians. Accordingly, Fr Edwards tells us, "with palpitating heart he sat daily for weeks on end in the Reading Room of the British Museum to study the case against the Virgin Birth." To his great relief he found that there was no case at all: "there is not a particle of evidence against the Virgin Birth that would not be dismissed at once if put before an impartial and instructed jury." Indeed, he found that the evidence *for* the Virgin Birth was "massive." In the circumstances it is perhaps natural that he should spend so much time scolding the naughty sceptical critics, who allowed prejudice to blind them so easily; and, as he is writing to reassure simple Christians, perhaps we ought not to complain if he finds it necessary to repeat his arguments and rebukes over and over again.

In the midst of all the scoldings and repetitions there is some quite good critical argument which would (for some readers at least) have appeared more convincing if it had not been smothered in so much tedious polemic. Fr Edwards has no difficulty in showing that the case of the sceptical critics is not very strong when carefully examined on strictly critical grounds. The argument from silence is seen to be no argument at all, and it is shown that it is by no means unreasonable to hold that St Paul (and certainly St John) knew of the Virgin Birth. Sometimes Fr Edwards tends to spoil his case by overstatement, but space does not permit of an examination of the details of his argument (such as whether the reading of the Verona Codex at John i, 13 is original). It is a pity that he is satisfied with an old-fashioned view of the gospels (he never doubts that St Mark is "the reminiscences" of St Peter), as Christians nowadays are not so "simple" as they used to be; but in fairness it must be said that his reply to the sceptical critics is a powerful counterblow, delivered with their own weapons.

Fr Edwards proves (if anyone still needed proof) that the sceptical critics' disbelief in the Virgin Birth is based not upon impartial historical investigations but upon their prior liberal assumptions. But he gives the impression that he thinks that he has himself established the historicity of the Virgin Birth on the basis of a purely disinterested historical inquiry. If he thinks this, he is himself the victim of a liberal

illusion—that of imagining that the writing of "impartial" history is possible. One of the most significant and far-reaching results of the twentieth-century revolution in the world of thought is the recognition that one's very view of what are the historical facts is "conditioned" by one's "ideological" assumptions—Catholic, Protestant, Marxist, liberal, and so on. We all wear spectacles, and when we take them off we can't see at all! Or, as Christians ought to have known all along, man's "reason" is fallen as well as his will, and justification is by faith alone—even in the realms of philosophical and historical inquiry. Fr Edwards will probably satisfy only the simple Christians who have not yet seen the complexity of this issue. The chapter on "The Virgin Birth and History" is the weakest in the book. To show that the sceptical critics can be defeated with their own weapons, those of literary and historical criticism, does not help those who have long ago seen through the fallacy of imagining that belief in any vital article of faith depends upon purely "disinterested" investigations of ancient documents! The real question about the Virgin Birth is not literary or historical but theological, and it is stated not by the Vincent Taylor of twenty years ago but by such leaders of post-liberal Christian thinking as Emil Brunner (*The Mediator*, pp. 322-7), to whom Fr Edwards does not allude. Perhaps one consideration advanced by Brunner is worth mentioning here. Like the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration, the doctrine of the Virgin Birth is an attempt to make the miracle of the Incarnation to some extent rational. Therefore both these doctrines, says Brunner, "are forms of little faith, not of great faith, and there is no reason at all to consider oneself a 'believer' in a special sense because one holds these views."

ALAN RICHARDSON.

DURHAM.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE SON OF MAN: A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By Rudolf Otto. Translated from the Revised German Edition by Floyd V. Filson and Bertram Lee-Woolf. New and Revised Edition. Lutterworth Press. 16s.

Since the appearance five years ago of the first edition of the English translation of *Reichgottes und Menschensohn*, Otto's book has attracted considerable attention in this country. Professor Lee-Woolf deserves our gratitude for providing a revised translation which does justice to this most important and remarkable work.

In his treatment of the Kingdom of God Otto insists upon the futility of supposing that the Kingdom as proclaimed by Jesus must be *either* present *or* future. His argument, amply backed by citation from the gospels, is that Jesus made use of the terms of apocalyptic but "ranged far beyond them by an idea which was entirely unique and peculiar to Him, that the Kingdom—supramundane, future, and belonging to the new era—penetrated from the future into the present, from its place in the beyond into this order, and was operative redemptively as a divine δύναμις, as an outbreaking realm of salvation." It will be noticed that Otto does not accompany those scholars who insist upon

confining the meaning of *kingdom* to its etymological sense of *kingship*, and that according to the description which he gives all that St Paul had to do was to restate in the new terms of redemption and salvation what Jesus had already taught.

Not the least of Otto's merits is his care in guarding the originality of Jesus. Thus he allows that Jesus made use of the conception of the Son of Man which He found in the Similitudes of Enoch, but sees the vital part of His teaching in His combination of the figures and functions of the supramundane Messiah, thought of as Enoch's Son of Man, with those of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii, and in His identification of both with Himself, the "redemptive saviour."

The test by which all reconstructions of Gospel theology must be judged is their success or failure in explaining the life of Jesus and in accounting for the emergence of the Church. Since theology and history are twin parts of one and the same act of revelation, an inadequate theology will fail to make sense of the life and death of Jesus and will leave no room for His resurrection. Judged by this test, Otto's work is a brilliant success. If this is what Jesus believed about Himself and His mission, it is understandable why He lived the life and died the death which the gospels record.

Although there are passages where the reader will find the interpretation forced, particularly in the third section, which deals with the Last Supper, these are less numerous than the others where Otto's remarkable theological insight suggests the presence of fresh and exciting meanings in familiar texts.

G. O. Williams.

Lampeter.

Preface to Bible-Study. By Alan Richardson. S.C.M. 5s.

This is an important book. It is important for three reasons: (1) The book helps the ordinary Christian reader (a term which includes ministers and theological teachers) to know a little of how to read the Bible as the standard and rule of Christian faith, and is a useful preparation of the production of what is urgent and overdue—namely, a theological and practical commentary on the Bible for the Christian reader. (2) It is greatly to be hoped that academic teachers of the Bible (especially of the Old Testament) will not dismiss this book as irrelevant, but will be moved by it to write works of Christian exegesis, as a supplement to the production of highly competent textbooks for examinations which treat the Bible as secular literature. (3) The book springs from the pioneer work of the World's Student Christian Federation, to whose courageous and devoted secretary, Mlle Suzanne de Dietrich, the book is fittingly dedicated. Criticisms of a minor order can, of course, be made of details (the last three chapters seem to me not quite so good as the first seven), but for the clarity of exposition and essential rightness of conception at the crucial points I have only unstinted admiration.

Canon Richardson writes first of the right approach to the Bible and says that the Bible is and remains the appointed means of God's

conversation with men. The Christian who reads the Bible in the spirit of prayer will expect to find in it God's word for himself. But what about the Higher Criticism? The answer is clear and definite. There can be no going back on the positions gained by the discoveries of biblical research. This new knowledge, properly received, is a means of strengthening our faith. The Bible is authoritative for us and for the whole Church of God because God speaks His word to us and to the whole Church through it; it is not that the words of the Bible are authoritative as they stand written. God visits the earth in the great crises of history. In the biblical history the three great crises are the Exodus from Egypt, the Exile in Babylon, and the Jewish rebellion against Rome which culminated in the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. The prophetic word spoken by Jesus in the crisis of the first century A.D. was God's final word to the world, and is thus the crisis of *all* history and of every human life. The Bible is a book of two Testaments and Christianity is a faith of two Covenants: the Church adopted the Jewish Bible as its own because it regarded the Old Testament as a book about Christ. The Pentateuch and the Prophets must be read Christologically. Not only the prophecy but also the myths, the poetry and the history are fulfilled in the Christian revelation. There are further chapters and useful appendices. This is undoubtedly a book to be read.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Biblical Politics: Studies in Christian Social Doctrine. By Alexander Miller. S.C.M. 2s. 6d.

One cannot expect all questions to be answered in a booklet containing five lectures given to ministers at Iona. But one can expect one of two things: either the popularization of what has received great expression or else the preparation for such treatment. Mr Miller's book falls into the second class and invites us to probe more deeply than we have done into the meaning of biblical law. His lectures deal with: I. The Crisis of Man's Existence—in which, in the light of the Incarnation, Mr Miller takes seriously the meaning of the Fall; II. Christianity and Marxism: the Christian Dialectic—in which there is a Christian criticism of the ultimate assumptions of Marxism, with acceptance, a little too easy in places, of Marxism as scientific sociology; III. The Problem of Power—in which there is a reframing of chapter xxiii of the Westminster Confession, "of the Civil Magistrate," in the light of fundamental biblical doctrine; IV. The Crisis of Contemporary Society—in which Mr Miller treats of war in relation to the views of Karl Barth and G. H. C. Macgregor, the meaning of conscientious objection, the function of a system of society and the ethical commonplaceness of the Pope's Five Points and the Five Points added by the leaders of the Churches in Britain; V. Personal and Corporate Discipline—in which "The National Average" is commended as a means of enabling the Church to surrender economic privilege and as a community to order its life in conformity to the Gospel. Mr Miller's judgments are most

controversial in this last lecture; to the reviewer the most dreadful weakness of the Church lies not in the sphere of witness to faith but in lack of faith itself.

Two comments are in order. The value of this booklet consists in the fact that it may stir its readers to take more seriously the meaning of biblical law for the Christian life. But we need a longer, more serious systematic treatment, and it is to be hoped Mr Miller will lay his hand to this. Secondly, Mr Miller opens the way for a true understanding of natural law. Granted that the Christian is guided by biblical law, as divine positive law, how far can the natural man, who, though fallen, is created in the Word of God and redeemed by the Word made flesh, understand something of this law? But this question lies outside the scope of this booklet.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Towards a Christian Order: A Volume of Essays, with an Introduction by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 9s.

The Future of Faith. Edited by Percy Colson. Hurst and Blackett. 6s.

There are two similarities in these volumes. In the first place, they both set out to cover more or less the same ground, and are both concerned with the admittedly urgent problem of the pattern of human society after the war. Secondly, they are both composite books. This means that both of them suffer from that unevenness which is all too common in books of this character, although this unevenness is much more marked in the case of the second. But here the similarities end, for though both have the same objective, and both are collections of essays, it is very difficult to compare them, largely because *The Future of Faith* seems to lack any rhyme or reason in its treatment of the subject. After a preface by Lord Vansittart in his characteristic fashion it meanders from subjects as diverse as The Church and Reincarnation to The Boy Scout Movement and The Artist in Society, taking in The Jewish Problem, Education, and God on the way. One reader at any rate put down this volume feeling very much like a drunken man who has been seeing pink elephants, completely lost in a maze of words. This is not to say that there are not certain individual contributions of real value in this volume, even if the total effect is bewildering. *Towards a Christian Order* is a far more serious attempt on the part of ten essayists to come to grips with the shape of things to come. This volume falls into two parts, the former dealing with The Christian Order and the second with What Shall the New Order Be? It is difficult to understand why the Editorial Committee included these last three essays at all, for though each claims to be the Christian Order they contradict each other and add little or nothing to the book as a whole, save that they may serve a useful purpose (though that was scarcely intended, no doubt) in warning the reader that at the moment Christians have little insight of the pattern of any Christian Order

that may be. Of the earlier essays that of Canon S. J. Marriott, on "The Soul of Man," is first not only in position, but also in importance. Indeed, the essays which follow one feels would have gained greatly in value if the writers had read and re-read this first essay before writing their own. As Canon Marriott warns his readers, "Nothing can alter the fact that the prime duty of the Church is to produce that holiness, that otherness, which alone can rescue the world from its deadly materialism and secularism. That the communist will denounce it as 'pie in the sky,' that the average man will say he is only interested in practical religion, must not deter us. Any short-cut to the Kingdom of God, which by-passes the tasking road of holiness, will in the end prove disastrous." The subsequent essays discuss in turn The Home, Education, Town Planning, Money, and Rural Life. All these in their various ways are worth careful study, though that by A. Trystan Edwards on Town and Country Planning seemed to me the most valuable as a piece of careful and constructive writing on this most urgent matter. Of the other essays, I would draw attention especially to that of Canon A. E. Baker on The Revival of Country Life, for it is written by one who has both a great love for and appreciation of the English countryside, as well as a keen insight of the many rural problems clamouring for solution. Not only should this essay be read by any priest who is working in the country, but a careful study of it by town clergy might do much to stimulate that sympathetic interest in the affairs of our rural population which is often so sorely lacking among town dwellers.

R. Ambrose Reeves.

Liverpool.

SHORTER NOTICES

The First Monks and Nuns (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 7s. 6d.) is an attractively written, popular account (containing a few inaccuracies) of the origin, in Egypt, of monasticism, by Fr Aloysius Roche; the author has most successfully performed a difficult task.

There is a hotel in the West of Ireland where on a Sunday morning the visitor is asked whether he will have a Catholic or a Protestant breakfast; *My Leader in Life* by Fr George Burns (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 2s. 6d.) nearly equals this by using the suggestive phrase "Catholic courtship" (p. 39); in spite of many pages of admirable teaching the bigoted spirit of this manual for boys leaving school makes the book a thoroughly unwholesome one; sweeping assertions of half-truths abound, such as " 'to Jesus through Mary' was the way of the saints" (p. 57), and "most of the non-Catholic religions were founded by persons such as King Henry, Queen Elizabeth, Martin Luther, John Knox, Calvin, etc." (p. 74). *Our Greatest Treasure*, by the late Fr John Kearney (Burns Oates and Washbourne, 8s. 6d.), is an exposition of the value of holding the Roman Catholic faith. The author argues closely and logically from such fundamental axioms as the existence of a Church furnished with an infallible, visible guide,

and its identification with the Roman Church, but displays an implacably narrow spirit. On page 44, for instance, the "Distress of those outside the Church" is described in these words: "They may have riches—what value are they at death? Dives had a good time—he was buried in hell;" on page 112 "non-Catholics" are expressly called enemies of Christ. The Epilogue, devoted to a eulogy of the Blessed Virgin Mary, is a masterly exhibition of how to draw the most confident conclusions from the most scanty evidence—indeed, in describing the Assumption, from no evidence at all. We are thankful to know that the work of this cloistered bigot does not represent the true spirit of Roman Catholicism.

Letters to a God-Daughter, by Nan Goodall (S.P.C.K., 2s.), is written for girls at the time of their confirmation with a sweetness of style and thought which is sometimes cloying but would appeal to the more sensitive; it is pleasantly illustrated.

DUBLIN. R. P. C. HANSON.

WE HAVE OUR ORDERS. By Joseph McCulloch. Michael Joseph. 10s. 6d.

The dominating phenomenon of this age is that religion and life have got separated. Mr McCulloch from within the organized Church sets to work in this book to express his own emotional reactions arising from the strain. Like many others in such a position, his very consciousness of the dilemma forces him to oversimplify his solution. He feels intensely that the average man or woman "wants unconditional Christianity" and that it would be sufficient as a mark of fellowship, and that the fellowship when so formed would by itself be an organ through which the Holy Spirit would function because of the unity. Therefore, for him, fellowship is the solution.

Mr McCulloch has put his finger on a major weakness of Christian practice, but the impression he leaves is that only fellowship is needed to release the powers of the Spirit without any consideration of the character of that fellowship. It does not follow that, if people are together, they will produce anything more than varieties of crowd psychology which may certainly be comforting because of the sense of community but are not necessarily spiritual. A Christian fellowship in name, which is just a fellowship and not fully Christian, because people feel the need of being together, is likely to make more difficulties for true religion than our present confusion, for in the casting out of the one evil of unfellowship the house may be left swept and garnished for seven other devils worse than the first.

It is not without significance that this book and Mr Aldous Huxley's *Grey Eminence* should appear within a year of each other—the one from within the organized Christian body, the other from without. For they both evidence the same disquiet and they both postulate an answer that seems to be more magical than religious. Mr Huxley asks for a new *mystique* and loses his way in a vague adumbration of an other-worldly technique to inspire a better ethic, while Mr McCulloch looks to a this-worldly recovery of fellowship as being the lever whereby the Spirit may operate in the plenitude of His power.

It is this contention which inspires his conclusion that the whole Church to-day lacks apostolic Orders. He would seem to place the character of Orders not in historic continuity nor in form but in an immediacy of experience—a very doubtful contention which has in more than one epoch of history brought disaster and schism. We have indeed to recover the fellowship of the Spirit, but there is no short-cut to holiness, nor to a fully integrated personality, nor to a living fellowship. The Church has always been reformed by those who are content to bear the strain of the inadequacy of the temporal form through which the Spirit operates in order to re-inspire it—not to break it. As Huxley has shown, a partial integration may be more dangerous both to the individual and to society than comparative indifference. The carrying out of a technique cannot by itself produce a blossoming of the Kingdom.

GILBERT SHAW.

LONDON.

STUDIES IN HISTORY AND RELIGION. Edited by Ernest A. Payne. Lutterworth Press. 21s.

These fourteen essays were written by former pupils (in one case a colleague) of Dr H. Wheeler Robinson and presented to him on his seventieth birthday. The volume is a graceful and impressive tribute to an eminent scholar and inspiring teacher who must feel gratified that he took a leading part in training a group of theologians and historians with such competence in so many fields. There is no unity of theme, but, as might be expected in view of Dr Wheeler Robinson's own dominant interest, a good half of the studies are on Biblical subjects. It cannot be said that any of the contributions marks a notable advance, but there are good discussions on a variety of problems. A vexed Old Testament question is well handled by J. N. Schofield in his article on "The Significance of the Prophets for Dating Deuteronomy." Professor E. L. Wenger writing on "The Problem of Truth in Religion" suggests persuasively that Indian Christian theology has something to say which Western Christians need to consider. The book ends with a valuable paper by the Editor on "Nonconformist Theological Education in the Nineteenth Century." The early history of Regent's Park Baptist College (of which Dr Wheeler Robinson was until lately Principal) is described in detail and there is much interesting information not readily accessible elsewhere. A bibliography of the writings of Dr Wheeler Robinson is also given.

JOHN LOWE.

CHRIST CHURCH,
OXFORD.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

Sir,

I have read Mr Middleton Murry's very interesting letter in the May issue of THEOLOGY with much appreciation but some surprise. For, on re-reading my review of the late Mr Max Plowman's book *The Right to Live* in your February issue, it seems clear that my query—"Is it Christianity?"—referred (as, of course, it was intended to refer) not to the "pacifist community movement" but to the "neo-Christianity" adumbrated in that book. I am glad that it has evoked so valuable a letter, but I should be very sorry if Mr Murry or any other reader continued to suppose that I was presuming to question the movement rather than the doctrine suggested in the book. To criticize a book is the reviewer's duty; to criticize a movement, the faith of which is, as Mr Murry shows, still unformed and unstated, is not.

Yours faithfully,

M. CHANING-PEARCE.

THE MANOR HOUSE,
IFFLEY, OXFORD.
May 31, 1943.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

BURNS OATES: L. C. Sheppard, *The English Carmelites* (6s.).
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (7s. 6d.); G. Johnstone, *The Doctrine of the Church in the New Testament* (10s. 6d.).
CENTENARY PRESS: Rosalind Murray, *The Life of Faith* (5s.); C. S. Lewis, *Christian Behaviour* (2s. 6d.).
CHURCH LITERATURE ASSOCIATION: *The Convocation of Canterbury and "Interchange of Preachers"* (6d.); J. V. L. Casserley, *Thy Kingdom Come* (2s. 6d.).
EVANGELISCHER VERLAG A. G. ZOLLIKON-ZÜRICH: Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Die Judenfrage im Lichte der Kapitel 9-11 des Römerbriefes* (Fr. 3).
GOLLANCZ: M. Samuel, *The Great Hatred* (3s. 6d.); C. E. Hudson, *Nations as Neighbours* (4s. 6d.); C. Singer, *The Christian Failure* (3s. 6d.).
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (OXFORD): S. K. Langer, *Philosophy in a New Key* (20s.).
METHUEN: Enid Blyton, *The Children's Life of Christ* (7s. 6d.).
MOWBRAYS: W. H. Elliott, *Prayer of the Passion* (2s.).
NATIONAL SOCIETY AND S.P.C.K.: G. W. O. Addleshaw, *Divine Humanity and the Young Worker* (8d.); H. Costley-White, *St. Luke's Story of Jesus* (5s.); Sister Frances Mary, C.R., *Educating towards a Christian Society* (6s.).
PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED PUBLISHING CO. (PHILADELPHIA): Oswald T. Allis, *The Five Books of Moses* ($3.00).
S.C.M. PRESS: A. M. Hunter, *The Unity of the New Testament* (5s.); A. Dun, *Not by Bread Alone* (5s.); H. P. Ehrenberg, *Autobiography of a German Pastor* (6s.); [American Church Leaders], *A Just and Durable Peace* (2s. 6d.).
SECKER AND WARBURG: H. J. Schonfield, *Judaism and the World Order* (4s. 6d.).
S.P.C.K.: S. C. Carpenter, *Exeter Cathedral, 1942* (2s.); M. Beza, *The Rumanian Church* (3s. 6d.); *A Directory of the Religious Life* (5s.).
STOCKWELL: G. L. Brand, *A Layman's View of St Paul* (n.p.); A. Woolcock, *The Eternal Problem* (2s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher